



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/627,650

07/28/2003

Tomoe Kawakami

04329.3102

3613

22852 7590 08/02/2007

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

YUEN, KAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

58

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/627,650	Applicant(s) KAWAKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kan Yuen	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7,9,11-13 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,7,9,11 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5, 12, and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's argument stated in the remark page 10, line 9-17 is not persuasive because the networks are denuded by circled area cn and c4. Applicant's argument stated in the remark page 13, lines 4-12 is not persuasive because Bergek responded to request of IP addresses from a first unit 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2616

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (Pat No.: 6246696).

For claims 1 and 9, Yamaguchi et al. disclosed the method of a first connection unit configured to connect with a first network; a second connection unit configured to connect with a second network different from the first network (see fig. 4); an ID acquisition unit configured to acquire a unique ID (see fig. 38, box 1610) of a partner device connected to the second network through the second connection unit (Yamaguchi et al. see column 38, lines 14-20); an ID comparison unit (Yamaguchi et al. see Fig. 38, box 1613) configured to compare the own unique ID of its own with the partner unique ID of the partner device; and a control unit (see Fig. 38, box 1612) which controls to set only one of the own unique ID and the partner unique ID to make the IDs inconsistent, when it is found as a result of comparison by the comparison unit that the own unique ID of its own coincides with the partner unique ID of the partner device (Yamaguchi et al. see column 38, lines 42-67, and see column 39, lines 1-10). As shown in fig. 4, the first circled area cn is considered as the first network, and the second circled area c4 is the second network. However, Yamaguchi et al. did not teach

Art Unit: 2616

all the subject matter of the claimed invention in one embodiment. Yamaguchi et al. disclosed the following limitations in different embodiment or obviousness: An ID generation unit configured to generate an own unique ID of its own, which is to be allocated on the first network (Yamaguchi et al. see column 31, lines 55-67). The address information or ID is generated by the own terminal; An ID notification unit configured to notify a partner device connected to the second network through the second connection unit of the own unique ID of its own (Yamaguchi et al. see column 25, lines 10-35, and lines 48-57, see Fig. 20, box 914). The communication terminal ID information and the own terminal are notified to the communication terminal ID information control section 915. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the obviousness in the network of Yamaguchi et al. The motivation for using the obviousness in the network of Yamaguchi et al. being that, it increases the flexibility of the interface.

6. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (Pat No.: 6246696), in view of Bergek et al. (Pub No.: 2004/0037284).

For claims 3 and 11, Yamaguchi et al. disclosed the method of an identification information collection unit (see fig. 38, box 1610) configured to collect first identification information from a partner device connected to the first network through the first connection unit (Yamaguchi et al. see column 38, lines 14-20); an identification information notification unit configured to notify the partner device connected to the second network through the second connection unit of the first identification information

Art Unit: 2616

(Yamaguchi et al. see column 25, lines 10-35, and lines 48-57, see Fig. 20, box 914); an identification information acquisition unit (see fig. 38, box 1610) configured to acquire second identification information from the partner device connected to the second network through the second connection unit (Yamaguchi et al. see column 38, lines 14-20). However, Yamaguchi et al. did not disclose the method of a reply unit configured to return the second identification information in response to an inquiry about the second identification information from the partner device connected to the first network through the first connection unit. Bergek et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the method of a reply unit configured to return the second identification information in response to an inquiry about the second identification information from the partner device connected to the first network through the first connection unit (Bergek et al. see paragraph 0042, lines 5-9, see fig. 1, box 201). The intermediate unit 2 responds to requests for IP addresses from a first unit 1. Thus, it would have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method as taught by Berget et al. in the network of Yamaguchi et al. The motivation for using the method as taught by Bergek et al. in the network of Yamaguchi et al. being that it responses to the request for IP addresses.

7. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (Pat No.: 6246696), in view of Takeda et al. (Pat No.: Pat No.: 6512767).

For claims 7 and 15, Yamaguchi et al., disclosed all the subject matter of the claim invention with the exception for a connection state change detection unit configured to detect a change in connection state on the first network; and a connection state change notification unit configured to notify the partner device connected to the second network of the change in connection state detected by the connection state change detection unit, as recited in claims 7 and 15.

Takeda et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the methods of a connection state change detection unit (see Fig. 6, box 602) configured to detect a change in connection state on the first network; and a connection state change notification unit (see Fig. 6, box 604) configured to notify the partner device connected to the second network of the change in connection state detected by the connection state change detection unit (see column 7, lines 55-67, and see column 8, lines 1-2). The motivation for using the methods as taught by Takeda et al. in the network of Yamaguchi et al. being that the transmission medium 602 monitors transmission medium and for detecting initialization of the transmission media.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2616

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kan Yuen whose telephone number is 571-270-2413. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00a.m-3:00p.m EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky O. Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ky


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER